

(99)

23 June 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR ALL RECRUITERS

By now you have all received your copy of the Rockefeller Commission Report. We encourage you to read it completely. However, we are, of course, not free to respond to comments on the Report.

The anticipated award to [redacted] I mentioned during my visit has materialized. On 24 June Don will be awarded the Career Intelligence Medal for his contribution to Recruitment. We will send copies of the actual citation after the ceremony.

STAT

I know you are pleased by the return to the single PHS form. What you may not appreciate is the promptness of the decision making process once the recommendation was formalized at the D/Pers level and sent on to the DD/A. Somewhere down the pike we will be reviewing the PHS for possible revisions of format. Of necessity, it will require extensive coordination prior to the expensive process of revising and reproducing a new PHS. Your suggested changes are welcome.

We would like to clarify the current policy re comments on the IR about an applicant's use of drugs. With rare exception, no comment is justified. There is appropriate opportunity for the applicant to provide the necessary detail. If, when you receive an applicant PHS the necessary detail is missing, please advise the applicant that the appropriate details in writing are a necessary part of the application. We cannot, under present ground rules, process an application without the details. If you feel that some comment is necessary on your part, please include that comment in a sealed envelope attachment, and note attachment on the IR. The object of this clarification is to stress that responsibility for providing the necessary detail rests with the applicant, not the recruiter. Since drug usage is such a frequent element in applicant files, we will expand on this subject during the conference.

We will appreciate your sending in those items you wish to have covered/clarified during the conference. We hope to send you a first draft of the conference agenda no later than late July.

POUCHED TO ALL RECRUITERS

Since there is a necessity to facilitate the processing of minority and handicapped cases, please adopt the following: At the bottom of the IR please put in all caps:

MINORITY: (KIND, eg. BLACK, HISPANIC-AMERICAN) HANDICAPPED)

Up to now, I have been functioning pretty much as a first line supervisor for the recruiters (as you can tell from my somewhat formalized and specific notes to you). This was necessary at the initial stage of assuming the duties of Chief of the Division. It also reflected the fact that Jack and I were both new to our jobs at the same time. Starting with the new fiscal year, I would like to change that organizational relationship and have Jack assume that role. This is in no way intended to change the directness of our relationship or communications, but it puts into neater organizational style the fact that Jack will be your rating officer and I will be the reviewer. It also acknowledges the fact that I am, of necessity, more frequently away from my desk than is Jack and acknowledges also the fact that Jack does handle the day to day review of cases and is responsible for the initial review and evaluation of the methodology and effectiveness of each field recruiter. With [redacted] encouragement, Jack and I plan to visit each recruiter in the field on alternate time frames (e.g. Recruiters Conference in early September, Jack to visit field o/a early January, Neil to visit field o/a early May). Jack and I operate in tandem and in the absence of one of us any and all matters can be handled by the other.

STAT

STAT

STAT

[redacted] for remedial surgery. I'm sure a card would be appreciated. On an interim basis [redacted] is filling in for her. We expect Dottie back to duty within a few weeks.

Presently we foresee no change in the ground rules for paid EOD travel as spelled out in the CSC guideline recently sent to you. At your pleasure, please give us your insights as to its effect on recruitment, especially of economists.

In response to your many inquiries, I regret I can't say we will significantly modify the discouragingly long review process involved in Black minority cases. I share your concern that the protracted delay (especially when most are rejected at the end of the long review) may be counter-productive to your good relations with some of your sources. The positive thing that can be said is that the "system" did significantly increase professional Black EODs in FY-74 vs. FY-73. We promise to keep considering better ways to achieve the same good results.

By early or mid-August, we expect to have another Quarterly Report on Requirements. Since this period would follow the closing date for the voluntary/involuntary retirement program now in progress, the resulting data should give us more and firmer data on the FY-76 requirements. In the meantime, keep the good economist files coming in. Be a bit more selective on CTP candidates (their external recruitment requirement is more apt to decline than grow). Once more let us emphasize the stand-down on "positive" recruitment of Clericals west of the Chicago/New Orleans line. We appreciate the increase in Hispanic files. Appropriate candidates for the DDS&T are still a high priority.



STAT

Chief, Recruitment Division

Question 4 of Attachment A to Review Staff Memorandum 75/3372 dated 5 November 1975.

On 12 July 1967, the DCI approved the guidelines for contracting with U. S. educational institutions. A copy of that memorandum is attached. Those guidelines state that:

CONSULTANT AND OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS

"Consultant and other types of personal services contracts with professors or other staff members of educational institutions within the United States will be held to a minimum and employed only when necessary. Additionally, such contracts will, as a general rule, be made only after assurance is obtained that appropriate management officials of the institutions concerned are aware of the proposed relationships."

Between September and December 1967, a case-by-case review was made of each consultant or independent contractor with a university affiliation to determine whether university management was aware of the professor's relationship with CIA. Action was taken by the Deputy Directors to have appropriate university officials made aware of the consultant's relationship with CIA.

If an individual who is associated with an educational institution is to be engaged as a consultant to CIA, the operating official submitting the request must state whether a senior official of the institution is knowledgeable of the proposed relationship with CIA. This is usually obtained in the form of a letter which the individual obtains from the head of his department or the dean of the university or college indicating no objection to the individual's consulting relationship.

We attempt to apply the same procedure to an independent contractor whose primary employer is a U. S. university or college.